

REMARKS

Claims 1-28 of the patent application were previously presented for examination. Claims 1-28 were rejected in the Office Action. Claims 1, 4, 6-8, and 12-14 have been amended and claims 15-28 have been canceled. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-14 are now pending in the Application for examination.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending claims and responds to the Office Action as follows:

AMENDMENT TO THE SPECIFICATION/CLAIMS

Applicant has corrected a typo in the Specification at line 7, page 11, as originally filed. Applicant has also amended claims to improve readability and to more particularly claim the present invention. No new matter has been added.

In this Amendment, Applicant has amended claims 1, 4, 6-8, and 12-14 and cancelled claims 15-28 from further consideration in this application.

Applicant is not conceding that the subject matter encompassed by claims 1, 4, 6-8, 12-14, and 15-28, prior to this Amendment is not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner. Claims 1, 4, 6-8, and 12-14 were amended and claims 15-28 were cancelled in this Amendment solely to facilitate expeditious prosecution of the allowable subject matter noted by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to pursue claims, including the subject matter encompassed by claims 1, 4, 6-8, 12-14, and 15-28, as presented prior to this Amendment and additional claims in one or more continuing applications.

EXAMINER'S RESPONSE TO PRIOR ARGUMENTS

Examiner has noted that prior arguments of 11/20/2007 were determined to be “not persuasive” and renewed the assertion that Oulid-Aissa (USP 5,835,757) “discloses a single database connection and multiple applications accessing a database using the connection.” (Office Action, page 2, section 3.1). Applicant respectfully disagrees and renews its disagreement with the statement, incorporating the arguments set forth previously, as well as those set forth in this compliant response.

OBJECTIONS TO THE SPECIFICATION/CLAIMS

Examiner has requested correction of “Claims 15-28” and has objected to such as not being “defined clearly in the Specification.” Although Applicant can clearly point to page 1, 2 and 13, as well as figures and other portions of the Specification for antecedent basis, Applicant has canceled claims 15-28 and accordingly has rendered the objection moot.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC § 103

Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 4-16, and 18-28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,835,757 issued to Oulid-Aissa (“Oulid-Aissa”) in view of US Patent No. 6,182,086 issued to Lomet et al. (“Lomet”). Examiner has asserted that Oulid-Aissa provides for application server requests over a single database connection. Examiner has also stated

that the reference provides for a first and second command source identifier.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Contradistinctive to Examiner's assertions, Oulid-Aissa does not provide for a single database connection as between a database server and an application server – rather, Oulid-Aissa expressly and explicitly states (*with emphasis added*): “...the distributed database **looks** like a centralized database **residing entirely in a single “logical” node**. The significance is that data can be organized in the distributed database in order to achieve optimum transaction processing **performance across multiple nodes**.” (See Column 10, lines 12-17).

Oulid-Aissa generally discloses a distributed database management system (DDBMS) system for switching applications (Abstract). More specifically, Oulid-Aissa discloses a Database Interface (DBIF) 302 to handle application request for database services (Column 12, lines 32-33). The DDBMS is distributed across multiple nodes on a back-end of the system, but appears as a single logical node to an application (Column 10, lines 12-17). A control mechanism in DBIF 302 allows an application to combine several database accesses into an atomic transaction (Column 10, lines 30-32). Thus, Oulid-Aissa discloses DBIF to interface a single application to multiple nodes.

Further, Oulid-Aissa does not provide for statements and command source identifiers which uniquely identify an application source to its respective statement. Rather, again contradistinctively to Examiner's assertion, Oulid-Aissa provides only for “commands.” The commands of Oulid-Aissa provide for: “Thus

DBIF 302 offers a published interface to application users in three categories of commands: (1) Transaction Control commands; (2) Generic Database Access commands; and (3) Service Database Access commands.” (Column 9, lines 63-66). These commands then allow an application to combine several database accesses into an “atomic transaction”, which then executed fully or not at all. However, these commands are received **from a single application** (i.e., “an application” Column 10, line 20). The commands of Oulid-Aissa are not either the command source identifiers or the query identifiers of the present invention, each of which, respectively, provides for uniquely identifying an application source to its respective statement or uniquely identifying its respective instance of an open cursor, for example.

Rather, Oulid-Aissa provides for commands for semi-permanent data in a DDBMS architecture for switching system computing and operations, and antithetically instructive for the present invention as it discloses receiving statements from a single application. Further, if the teachings of Oulid-Aissa were embraced by the present invention, the present invention would not function as desired.

Examiner has also suggested that Lomet discloses a second command source identifier. Again, Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Lomet provides for an application identifier and a message sequence number in a client-server system, thereby creating a distinct set of two numbers. The provision of two tags fails to uniquely identify an application source in respect to a statement, as in the present invention. In fact, Lomet is not

interested in nor instructive in doing so, for Lomet is configured to provide tagging for message traffic and is not related to distinguishing or indentifying application sources in relation to statements. Further the unique application identifier of Lomet cannot distinguish different sources from within an application. Additionally, and more problematically, using Lomet, statements from different sources would result in section collision. Thus, Lomet fails to the second source command source identifier of claim 1.

Therefore, Applicant asserts that the cited references, alone or in combination, do not disclose nor teach towards Applicant's invention and further believes that the references are rather antithetic thereto.

Independent claim 1 is also representative of independent claim 8. Specifically, claim 1 is directed towards a method for avoiding section collision for application server requests over a single database connection. The method comprises (*with emphasis added*) avoiding section collision for application server requests **over a single database connection between a database server and an application server**, by:

(a) receiving a first statement assigned a first command source identifier by the database server from a first application source **over the single database connection, the first command source identifier uniquely identifying an application source to the first statement;**

(b) receiving a second statement assigned a second command source identifier by the database server from a second application source **over the single database connection, wherein the first statement is substantially**

identical to the second statement; the second command source identifier uniquely identifying an application source to the second statement and,

(c) executing the first statement assigned a first command source identifier separately from and in parallel with the second statement assigned the second command source **without section collision.**

Advantageously, multiple instances of the same cursor can be processed without section collision.

Therefore, Applicant submits that, as amended, independent claim 1, and related dependent claims, are patentable over the combination of Oulid-Aissa and Lomet, and the other prior art of record. Similarly, independent claim 8 and related dependent claims, are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly Applicant asserts all rejections have been rendered moot or have been traversed, and respectfully requests Examiner to withdraw all rejections. Applicant therefore respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims as now presented.

Applicants submit that the proposed amendments presented do not raise new issues or necessitate the undertaking of any additional search of the art by the Examiner, since all of the elements and their relationships claimed were either

earlier claimed or inherent in the claims as examined. Therefore this Amendment should allow for immediate action by the Examiner.

Applicants respectfully request entry of this amendment and timely notice of allowance. Furthermore, Applicants submit that entry of this Amendment would place the application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of the pending claims.

Applicant's attorney believes this application is in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

April 15, 2008

/Joseph A. Sawyer/
Joseph A. Sawyer
Reg. No. 30,801

Customer Number 45728

(650) 493-4540
(650) 493-4549